

Still further, the requirement alleges unpatentability of claim 1, but does not explicitly apply any prior art. Instead, the requirement makes an mere allegation of unpatentability by using the term "suggested", and merely references U.S. Patent No. 6,023,659 without supplying a copy, listing the document on a Form PTO-892, or indicating how the claimed subject matter is "suggested". Clearly, this is not appropriate for establishing unpatentability of the claimed subject matter.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner seriously reconsider the requirement, and withdraw the same so as to give an examination on the merits on all of the claims pending in this application.

### CONCLUSION

For the reasons discussed above, it is respectfully submitted that the requirement for restriction is improper because unity of invention is present. Withdrawal of the requirement for the restriction with examination of all pending claims is respectfully requested.

Favorable consideration with early allowance of the application is most earnestly requested.

If the Examiner has any questions, the Examiner is respectfully invited to contact the undersigned at the below-listed telephone number.

Respectfully submitted,  
Akiko ITAI et al.

Bruce H. Bernstein  
Reg. No. 29,027

December 27, 2002  
GREENBLUM & BERNSTEIN, P.L.C.  
1941 Roland Clarke  
Reston, VA 20191  
(703) 716-1191